DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 903 CS 005 992

AUTHOR Sulzby, Elizabeth
TITLE When Kindergarteners Read and Write: Focus upon Told and Dictated Story Characteristics.
SPONS AGENCY National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, Ill.; National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 81
GRANT NIE-G-80-0176
NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Los Angeles, CA, April 13-17, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beginning Reading; *Educational Research; Handwriting; Kindergarten; *Kindergarten Children; Language Acquisition; Language Experience Approach; *Language Processing; *Learning Readiness; *Oral Language; Primary Education; *Story Telling; Verbal Ability; Writing (Composition)

ABSTRACT

Kindergarten children differ in how close they are to becoming readers and writers. A study investigated the dictated and handwritten materials of 24 kindergarten children. In each of two sessions, three language productions were obtained: a told story, a dictated story, and a handwritten story. Additionally, samples of rereading and editing were gathered for each of the two written versions. Samples were scored on a seven-point scale based upon the nature of the written productions and the degree of matching eyes and voice to print. Adaptations to modes were scored in three ways: intonation patterns were marked, fluency was described, and the telling and dictating were described holistically with a descriptive narrative. Results indicated that a large number of five-year-old children showed the ability to sound as if they were dictating; that children were able to sound as if they were telling a story and to actually maintain an oral monologue; that children who were high in reading abilities adapted dictation toward writing; and that children who were low in reading abilities moved their telling more toward the conversational mode. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED200903

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

When Kindergarteners Read and Write:

Focus Upon Told and Dictated Story Characteristics

Elizabeth Sulzby

Northwestern University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Elizabeth Sulzby
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
Los Angeles, California
April 1981

The work reported herein is sponsored primarily by the Research Committee of the National Council of Teachers of English and the Faculty Research Committee of Northwestern University. Additional support has been furnished by the National Institute of Education (NIE-G-80-0176). The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the supporting agencies.

CS505992

When Kindergarteners Read and Write:
Focus Upon Told and Dictated Story Characteristics

Elizabeth Sulzby[1]
Northwestern University

This paper examines differences between story telling and story dictation of kindergarten children who are learning to read and to write. Increasingly, researchers (Bissex, 1980; Clay, 1978; Goodman & Goodman, 1979) have begun to investigate the intersection of reading and writing acquisition. Additionally, reading and writing acquisition are viewed as part of the more inclusive issue of the literacy culture of the child, specifically the relationship within the culture of oral and written modes of communication (Anderson, Teale, & Estrada, 1980; Cook-Gumperz & Gumperz, in press; Gundlach, in press; Harste, Burke, & Woodward, in press; Sulzby, 1981b; Teale, 1980; and Vygotsky, 1978).

The research reported in this paper is part of a long-range project, "Beginning Readers' Developing Knowledges About Written Language," designed to examine oral language and written language differences and how these differences are negotiated by the child

[1]The author thanks Margaret Policastro for assistance in data collection and thanks Susan Anderson, Beverly Cox, Beverly Otto, and Harriet Rabenovets for assistance in scoring and analysis.

at the stage of learning how to read. In this paper, the reading materials used by the child come from the child's own handwritten and dictated compositions and the oral language samples, from stories told to a listener and stories dictated to a scribe (told and dictated stories). The term "story" is used to indicate the composed unit, regardless of any possible genre classification, because the children were requested to write a "story."

It has been difficult to study the transition from pre-reading to reading (Sulzby, 1980, 1981a, 1981b). Part of the difficulty has revolved around four problems which have begun to be addressed by combining information coming from both reading and writing research. The four problems are: 1) the nature of reading materials for beginners; 2) the under-defined nature of the reading task for novices; 3) the difficulty of measuring initial reading attempts; and 4) the over-simplification of the transition between oral language and written language. Each of these problems will be considered briefly.

Reading materials for beginners. Various proposals and attempts have been used to control the difficulty level of materials so that beginners may be eased into reading more successfully. Published teaching materials have used vocabulary controlled by frequency of "natural" occurrence; controlled by individual letter-sound

relationships; or controlled by larger units such as spelling patterns.

Using children's oral language "written down" has long been suggested as appropriate first reading material (Stauffer, 1970) because more elements may be controlled simultaneously. For example, the syntactic patterns, vocabulary, and subject matter (concepts and schemata) are taken from the individual child who composed the dictation, as such materials are called. Objections have been raised about the way in which such materials relate to oral language (Sulzby, 1980); nevertheless, dictations provide one type of beginning reading material with promise for researching the transition. Handwritten materials may also be used if children are allowed to use their own writing systems (Beers & Henderson, 1977; Read, 1979; Vygotsky, 1978). Thus reading may become a natural means of monitoring orally-composed messages (Graves, 1979) as they relate to written language (Sulzby, 1981b).

It is possible that beginning reading research must examine the task demands placed by each kind of reading material for beginners as well as the support that each kind of control furnishes the beginner. This study investigates the dictated and handwritten materials of kindergarten children.

Under-definition of the task for the novice. It has been noted that children learning to read often show confusions about the task, not knowing that it is the black marks that are read (Clay, 1978), not knowing that oral words are separated by spaces when they are written down (Downing, 1979; Ehri, 1979), or not knowing that the "text" or composition can remain stable and can be used as a source of matching voice to print (Sulzby, 1980, 1981a). Many of these presumed confusions can be clarified by examining handwritten materials by young children. Even when the child is using pretend-cursive or drawing along with oral accompaniment, an adult can assess more specifically what the child does know about elements of reading and writing such as 1) segmentation, phonetic and phonemic coding, etc.; 2) conventional well-learned units, such as whole words; and 3) whether the child is able to treat larger units (sentences and "stories") as stable objects for reflection and memory. By comparing handwritten and dictated materials, a researcher can compare the child's knowledge of the conventional writing system with the child's inventions. Such a comparison can shed light on task-definition in terms of what gets read versus what gets written versus what was said.

Measurement of emergent reading abilities. The third difficulty in studying early reading has been finding

appropriate measures of early behavior--emergent reading and writing abilities (Clay, 1978; Holdaway, 1979; and Goodman & Goodman, 1979). The problem of phonetic coding, phonemic coding, and word segmentation is an illustration of this issue. When five or six-year-old children are asked to do oral or reading tasks to illustrate segmentation (Ehri, 1979), they appear to be very poor at these tasks. Yet children are able to segment in order to use invented spellings. Read (1979) explains that the segmentations are not appropriate to adult conventions, yet the appearance of the abilities within the child's repertoire illustrates that the child has the basic segmentation abilities. As another example, when a child is reading, it is difficult to know whether a child has actually sounded-out an entire word or has also used syntactic and semantic information to assist the decoding, even when a child gives evidence of some decoding: "/g/, /g/, /gI/, girl!" Thus, it is difficult to know what abilities the beginning reader is using in a given task.

Also, early reading behavior fluctuates (Sulzby, 1980). The young beginning reader is easily threatened by task and situation demands. The child who remembers a story verbatim and uses reading intonation while looking in the general direction of the page may forget the story and lose reading intonation when directed to point to each word or to sound-out a given word. That same child may be able to use each ability voluntarily when reading a short list of words or a caption.

One solution to this problem is to analyze the demands of different reading tasks in relation to the support that each offers the child. For instance, if the child attempts to re-read his own handwritten composition, one would expect that the text would both be remembered verbatim and that the child would be able to attend to letter-sound cues for re-reading; whereas, if the child were re-reading from dictation, s/he should be able to depend upon memory for text but have less ability to attend to individual word or letter-sound cues. If the text were, on the other hand, unfamiliar material composed by another person, attention would have to be directed more to letters and words and less upon the possible meaning of the text, which would have to be constructed, bit by bit.

Thus, measurements of beginning reading attempts need to be multiple and based upon the nature of the materials and related task demands. Clay (1978) and Holdaway (1979) have suggested such analyses as has Sulzby (1981a, 1981b). Such measurements need to take into account more kinds of information from the child: 1) what the child is able to do correctly by adult standards; 2) how the child approximates adult behavior before s/e can produce the behavior correctly; 3) what the child can do with adult help, and 4) what the child says about what s/he can do or cannot yet do.

Oral language/written language transition.

A fourth problem in studying beginning reading is that the acquisition of written language has been conceived as simply added to oral language at the point when the child begins reading. The transition from oral language to written language can be described in various ways. I have held elsewhere (Sulzby, 1981a; Tucker, 1977) that many of the distinctions are artificial and become blurred, depending in part upon the language context, culture, and purpose of the individual.

Conversation, for instance, has been described as being contextually-bound. If, however, conversation is banter between two peers at a bar that conversation may be very context-bound. If the conversation is in a formal setting such as a colloquium, the conversation may be very de-contextualized and may sound like written language. A literate adult language user may be able to shift between modes of language such as conversation, oral monologue, and written language easily and appropriately because the modes have become distinct. Even with adults, however, the modes can become blurred as Flower (1979) points out, but these same adults can be helped to use such distinctions because, for them, the modes can be separated.

Children vary in their acquisition of the distinctive use of language modes, even within a given literacy culture.

Many American children are reared in literate homes within a literate culture. Others are reared in homes with varying degrees of literacy within the literate culture. Still other children are reared within a culture that is primarily oral (see Scollen & Scollen, 1979; Heath, 1980). For children reared in literate homes within a literate culture, however, it is appropriate to treat written language as developing alongside and as being influenced by oral language development (Goodman & Goodman, 1980; Harste, Burke, & Woodword, in press).

Within a literate culture, researchers (Clay, 1978; Hildreth, 1936; Read, 1979; and Scollen & Scollen, 1979) have focused attention upon early approximations to reading and writing behavior even before the oral/written distinctions have become mastered. Such approximations are also being examined between cultures that differ in terms of language mode emphases (Anderson, Teale, & Estrada, 1980; Heath, 1980; Scollen & Scollen, 1979; and Teale, 1980).

Sulzby (1980) has claimed that children within a literate culture do not all seem to acquire written language knowledges in the same order. Bissex (1980)

indicated that her son did not language knowledges in the same way across the modes of reading and writing at the point of initial acquisition. Even with these differences in relation to language modes, within and across cultures, it is important to define how the language modes may appear to and be used by the beginning reader.

Vygotsky (1978) and Holdaway (1979) suggest that language is a complex system that the child acquires by developmental reorganization. They contend that, because language is a complex system with many aspects to become coordinated, development will show trends that appear to move backward as well as forward from an adult perspective. From my data, it also appears that the addition of new knowledge may prompt an over-adapting to the new knowledge. For instance, the child who learns that words are separated by spaces in written language may begin to dictate to a scribe using an exaggerated, word-by-word oral pausing, with sentence-final intonation for each separate word, even though that extreme spacing is not needed by the scribe and even though the intonation is misleading about the relation of one word to the following word.

Disruptions or over-adaptations may only be noted, however, if we have a reference to expected differences between the language modes. The following section

presents expected differences between the modes, as conceptualized for this study.

Modes and How They May Differ.

While dictated and handwritten materials help give some evidence relevant to the problems of studying beginning reading acquisition, using such materials makes it even more important that we consider differences between language modes, including the oral modes, and how these differences may appear to the beginning reader and writer. For purposes of this study, four language contexts will be considered important and will be called "modes," as opposed to the oral language/written language dichotomy: 1) conversation; 2) storytelling (or oral monologue); 3) dictation; and 4) handwritten composition.

Conversation. In conversation, information is exchanged between two speakers. The speakers are also listeners and monitor the communications of both participants. Garvey (1977) has shown that very young children can take account of a message from another child and make comments and ask questions that are contingent upon the speech of another in order to maintain the information exchange and conversational continuity. In conversation, neither speaker has to carry the entire burden; instead, the burden is shared.

Storytelling. In storytelling, one speaker is expected to maintain an oral monologue (see Johnson, 1977) and another person or persons is/are expected to listen.

The speaker must keep the attention of the listeners but s/he is responsible for informational continuity and completeness. The information is given in a transient manner and cannot be reviewed by the listener. Thus the speaker needs to give the information in an interesting and expected fashion. When a listener needs to stop the storyteller for clarification, the storytelling mode expectations have been violated, in the direction of conversational expectations. The mode has been adapted toward conversation.

Dictation. In dictation, one person is the speaker who must maintain an oral monologue. A second person serves as a scribe and writes down what the speaker says. (I will ignore the more adult use of tape recorders, etc.) The speaker must compose a message, which should be appropriate for written language (in other words, for reading by an absent audience). The message should also be adapted to the needs of the scribe who is taking the dictation. The scribe assumes the burden of the actual handwriting but communicates needs to the speaker (see Gould, 1980; Sulzby, 1980). For example, the scribe needs the speech of the speaker to be clear, to be guided by the scribe's writing speed, and for intonation and segmentation to be coordinated to the conventions of the writing system.

Handwritten composition. In handwritten composition, the person conveying the message stops speaking and

uses a graphic mode of communicating a message. This person becomes the writer, rather than speaker, and must deal with all of the constraints of written language: message composition and structure, spelling, punctuation, etc. The audience is no longer present, even in the intermediate form of a scribe, and must be imagined for effective communication. The writer must also be the sole monitor of the message effectiveness.

Children and Mode Distinctions

It is not appropriate to consider children from a given culture as simply making a transition from oral language to written language, but to consider how the modes interact as the child acquires literacy within a given language culture. Even within a literate culture, it is not to be expected that young children will make all the distinctions between modes described above, but it is also not appropriate to assume that such children are completely naive to such distinctions.

The purpose of this paper is to describe two of the modes primarily, in relation to the two other modes, for children reared in a literate culture. The paper will describe told and dictated stories and how young children adapt these two modes so that they resemble the related modes of conversation and handwritten composition, depending upon the child's acquaintance with written language.

For kindergarten children, it might be expected that told and dictated modes would be treated as exactly the same: both appear to be conditions in which a message is told to a listener. However, kindergarten children differ in how close they are to becoming readers and writers, and that emerging language ability may be observed in possible adaptations that they make in producing the two types of stories: told and dictated.

A young language user who is just acquiring literacy may simply tell a story in both modes, without considering the scribe's needs in the dictated mode. Or the child may not be able to proceed without interaction with the other person, thus adapting the telling or the dictated mode more toward conversation. Or the young child may begin to learn about the constraints of the handwritten mode and adapt or even over-adapt to the needs of the scribe.

The study is organized around three questions:

1) Is it possible to develop a naturalistic assessment procedure for a child's attempted re-readings of hand-written and dictated stories that will meet some typical reliability and validity requirements?

2) a) Do children distinguish between the modes of telling and dictation, and

b) do children's distinctions also include adaptations

toward related language modes, such as conversation and handwritten composition?

3) Do adaptations toward related language modes differ according to the level of emergent reading abilities of the child?

Predictions are appropriate to the two latter questions. It is predicted that five-year-old children are able to distinguish between the two modes but that these modes are confused with related modes and that the confusions with related modes are predictable. It is predicted specifically 1) that children who are beginning to read independently will have and exhibit more knowledge about written language as shown by adaptations of dictation toward handwritten composition and 2) that children who are farther from being able to read independently will exhibit and use language more characteristic of oral modes, particularly of conversation.

Method

Because the data reported in this paper are drawn from a larger study, the general outline of data collection will be presented.

Subjects. The children were members of one kindergarten classroom in an upper-middleclass community north of Chicago, Illinois. The mean age in October was 5-4 (range, 4-11 to 5-10). There were 13 females and 11 males. The classroom was chosen because population characteristics, particularly the literacy culture description, were available, classroom membership was stable, and the researchers were welcomed into the classroom for longitudinal study. A further over-riding consideration for this study was the fact that reading and writing were not taught as a planned part of the curriculum.

Data collection. The classroom teacher administered the Metropolitan Readiness Tests, Level 1, in October, 1979, as part of normal school procedure. Stories were gathered by trained examiners from mid-October to mid-December, with approximately a month between sessions. The examiners had been in the classroom two to three times a week from the third week of school and an interview concerning general reading and writing abilities had been conducted prior to this study.

For the story collection sessions, one of two examiners took each child separately to a quiet spot where the child was put at ease, re-acquainted with the tape-recorder and other procedures, and then asked

"to write a story."

In each of the two sessions, three language productions were obtained: a told story, a dictated story, and a handwritten story. Additionally, samples of re-reading and editing were gathered for each of the two written versions. The six possible orders of telling, dictating, and writing were counterbalanced and assigned to subjects at random, with re-reading and editing following dictating and writing wherever they appeared in the order.

The children were told that the examiner wanted them to write a story. An abbreviated version of the directions are given below:

General directions.	I WANT YOU TO WRITE A STORY FOR ME. WE WILL DO IT THREE WAYS. NOW I KNOW YOU DON'T REALLY KNOW HOW TO WRITE LIKE A GROWN-UP YET BUT YOU KNOW A LOT ABOUT WRITING. I'LL HELP YOU.
Telling.	ONE OF THE THINGS PEOPLE DO TO WRITE A STORY IS TO TELL IT TO SOMEONE FROM THE BEGINNING TO THE END TO BE SURE THEY HAVE IT THE WAY THEY WANT IT TO BE. THAT'S WHAT I WANT YOU TO DO NOW. TELL ME YOUR STORY, YOUR WHOLE STORY FROM BEGINNING TO END. . . . (Story directions.)
Dictation.	ONE OF THE THINGS PEOPLE CAN DO TO WRITE A STORY IS TO LET SOMEONE ELSE WRITE IT DOWN FOR THEM. THAT'S LIKE HAVING A SECRETARY. WE CALL IT DICTATING WHEN YOU TELL YOUR STORY AND SOMEONE ELSE WRITES IT DOWN FOR YOU. I WANT YOU TO DICTATE YOUR STORY FOR ME THIS TIME. . . . (Story directions.)
Writing.	SOMETIMES WHEN PEOPLE WRITE A STORY THEY DO THE WRITING ON PAPER ALL BY THEMSELVES. EVEN LITTLE BOYS AND GIRLS CAN WRITE THEIR OWN STORIES. YOU CAN WRITE YOUR OWN STORY FOR ME YOUR OWN WAY. IT DOESN'T HAVE TO BE JUST LIKE GROWN-UP WRITING. YOU CAN JUST DO IT YOUR OWN WAY. NOW I WANT YOU TO WRITE YOUR STORY. . . . (Story directions)

The story directions were inserted into each of the three mode directions, then the directions to tell, dictate, or write were reiterated. The story directions asked alternatively for real and make-believe topics. (The topic variable is not discussed in this paper, but in shown in the directions, within parentheses.)

Story directions.

I WANT YOU TO TELL ME YOUR STORY (DICTATE YOUR STORY TO ME, WRITE ME YOUR STORY) AND IT'S A REAL (MAKE-BELIEVE) STORY ABOUT YOU (LITTLE PRINCE/PRINCESS CHARMING) AND HOW YOU (S/HE) LEARNED HOW TO RIDE A BIG WHEEL:
ABOUT HOW YOU (S/HE) LEARNED TO RIDE A BIG WHEEL,
WHAT MADE YOU (HER/HIM) WANT TO DO IT,
AND HOW YOU (S/HE) DID IT.

Directions for re-reading were simple:

Re-reading directions.

GOOD JOB. NOW I WANT YOU TO READ BACK YOUR STORY TO SEE IF IT IS JUST LIKE YOU WANT IT TO BE.

If the child protested that s/he could not read, the examiner said she could help the child and asked the child what help was wanted. If the child did not specify the kind of help but still said s/he couldn't read, the examiner initiated choral-reading and used fading techniques to determine if the child could use memory for text to continue without the examiner's help.

Other specific probings of aspects of reading were used in the editing task, but that part of the study will not be discussed in this paper.

Transcriptions and protocols. Children's hand-written compositions and the scribe's copy of the dictation were preserved as protocols. The total session was tape-recorded and subsequently transcribed by the examiner. Each examiner double-checked her own transcription. Observational materials and the written products were coordinated with the transcript by the examiner. Forty-four percent of the tapes were checked against the typed protocols by a trained assistant. (It should be noted that there were thus two versions of the dictation: the told version and the version written by the scribe from which the re-reading was done. Differences between these two versions were used in judging stability of the text for the child.)

Scoring. The Metropolitan Readiness Tests, Level 1, was administered to each child and scored according to the examiner's manual directions by the classroom teacher. Those scores were taken from the children's cumulative folders by the examiners and used in the analyses for this paper.

Assessments of emergent reading ability (hereafter called Reading Judgments) were obtained for each child from the dictated and handwritten stories produced by each child and from the child's behavior in attempting to re-read each type of story. Thus four sources were used for each judgment: dictated story; re-reading of dictated story; handwritten story; re-reading of handwritten story. A 7-point scale (see Table 1) based upon the nature of the written productions and the degree of matching eyes and voice to print was used, with two independent judges scoring all protocols. One score was obtained for each session, with percent of agreement being 96% between raters for each session.

Adaptations to modes were scored in three ways: 1) Intonation patterns were marked: voice final intonation, voice rising, voice continuing. These intonation patterns were marked wherever they appeared since children often "dictated" as if they were reading a word list.

2) Fluency was described: all pauses, both those that were filled with behavior, such as sound-ing out a word or with quiet writing, or with verbal asides, were noted. All exchanges between the child and examiner were noted.

3) The telling and dictating were described holistically, with a descriptive narrative. A rater listened to the taped-version and gave a narrative description. An example of such a description is: "The child dictated very fluently, running all ideas together with no regard for the examiner's writing. She used a conversational intonation." These judgments were compared with judgments made by the original examiner. In case of disagreements, tapes were re-examined until consensus was reached.

Results

The results will be presented in three parts: 1) assessment of reading ability; 2) distinction and adaptation of modes and 3) mode adaptation in relation to reading ability.

Assessment of Reading Ability

Emergent Reading Ability Judgments ("Reading Judgments"): From student protocols, Reading Judgments were calculated for each of the two sessions. These two scores were used in two ways: a) to check for consistency between the two sessions and b) to compare with the standardized reading readiness test scores.

Reading Judgments between sessions 1 and 2. While the time between sessions varied from four to six weeks during which time children could change in reading ability, it was still necessary to determine the stability of the reading judgments. A rank order correlation was performed comparing the two sessions over 24 students. The result of this comparison was rho=.77 (corrected for ties), $p < .01$.

Comparison of reading judgments to readiness test scores. Because the correlation between the two sessions was high and because it was considered to be preferable to have more rather than fewer measures of reading ability, the scores from session 1 and session 2 were averaged, thus yielding a conservative measure of

emergent reading ability. This averaged score was then compared with total raw scores of the Metropolitan Reading Readiness Tests, Level 1, by converting both sets of scores into ranks.

The rank order correlation between the Reading Judgments and the Metropolitan was rho = .37, for 22 children (two children did not have scores for the Metropolitan). This correlation is significant at $p = <.05$, corrected for ties.

The above correlations, while significant, are modest and must be interpreted cautiously, particularly since the total picture is only beginning to emerge. For those reasons, scores from each of the two sessions of this study and from the Metropolitan were used to select children in which there was a consistent pattern of being high or low in reading-related abilities. These classifications are used for the final comparison between high and low students in relation to mode adaptations.

Distinction and Adaptation of Modes

The second topic to be explored is to what degree kindergarten children from a literate culture who have not been taught reading and writing in school are able to distinguish between the two modes of telling and

dictating and/or make adaptations affecting the two modes in the direction of related modes.

Distinction between telling and dictating. Twenty-one children produced both told and dictated stories. (One child refused to tell stories; one child refused to dictate stories; and one child produced neither told nor dictated stories.) Of the 21 who produced both kinds of stories, twelve distinguished clearly between dictating and telling as judged by the overall narrative descriptions. These distinctions varied from a child who dictated in a word-by-word fashion and told in a conversational intonation pattern to a child who used sentence-final intonation in dictating but voice-continuant intonation between sentences in telling. Each mode will be described separately in relation to adaptations toward related modes.

Overall dictated stories. Dictated stories were analyzed to determine whether the overall story or parts of the story sounded like dictation. Fourteen children (of 22 who dictated = 64%) were judged to sound as if they were dictating for both of their dictated stories. An additional two children (16=73%) sounded as if they were dictating on their second, but not first, dictated story.

Parts of the dictation. Eighteen children (82%) used some unit-by-unit phrasing in some part of their dictation, thus showing adaptation toward the handwritten

mode. Seven of the children used a word-by-word phrasing throughout; this phrasing was keyed to, although not perfectly aligned with, the speed of the scribe's writing. These children were observed to be watching the scribe and/or to be using a list-like intonation or long pauses marking the boundary between words.

Seven other children used variable units (words, phrases, short sentences) as places to pause. They did this without being prompted by the examiner to slow down. Four children slowed their dictation only after prompts by the scribe. Prompts were worded thus: "I can't keep up. Here's where I am." Then the scribe re-read part of the dictation. Of those four children, two finally responded to the prompts only on the second story. These two children then paused in an exaggerated fashion, pausing long periods of time not directly keyed to the scribe's speed of writing. Both of these children maintained an extremely conversational type of discourse throughout the sessions.

In addition to the 18 children who used some unit-by-unit phrasing in dictation, two children sounded as if they were dictating when they told their stories. These children were very advanced and were already reading to some degree.

Told stories. While children were able to signal either entirely or in part that they were dictating, they also maintained elements of conversation within their told and dictated stories. The purpose of this section is to examine the told stories for signs of adaptations of the mode toward conversation, but it should be remembered that these elements also appeared in some of the dictations as well.

In the telling mode, a child is expected to maintain an oral monologue, or to treat the story as an entity with integrity and wholeness. A child is also expected to treat the story as an entity within dictating and writing as well. A child who adapts telling (or other modes) toward conversation is indicating that s/he needs help in creating a self-contained entity.

Twenty-two children produced told stories. Twelve of these 22 children (55%) adapted their story-telling toward conversation in that they engaged in conversational turn-taking characteristics in producing the story.

Two kinds of data were taken from the protocols as evidence for such conversational characteristics. First, six of the children treated the initial directions as if they called for a conversational-turn (cf. Bereiter & Scardamalia, in press). They began to speak immediately

after the directions, as compared with other children who paused to plan before beginning to tell their story. These children gave one brief, contingent utterance and then stopped as if their turn were done. (Like one boy who began just after the directions about how he learned to ride a big wheel, saying quickly and completely, "By watching other people.") These children required an adult prompt to keep going, if they did continue.

A second way in which children adapted toward conversation instead of telling a complete story was to require questions from the adult to keep going. Six additional children required such questions to maintain the discourse. (Additionally, three children were dependent upon the adult to end the discourse. They did not clearly signal to the adult that they were finished. These children were not classified as using turn-taking behavior, however, because that judgment seems to be unjustified, given that they had maintained the discourse up to that final point.)

Children adapted toward dictation and toward conversation in their stories. The final question to be addressed is whether children who adapt discourse toward writing can be considered as more advanced than children who adapt discourse toward conversation.

Mode Adaptation in Relation to Reading Ability

The final comparison was to examine the told and dictated story mode adaptations of children clearly viewed as high or low in emergent reading abilities. Six children were selected in each category. Of the "high" children, four were above the median on all three measures (two Reading Judgments and the Metropolitan) and two others were above the median on two of the three measures. Of the six low children, two were below the median on all three measures and four were below the median on two of the three.

These two groups of children, high and low, were compared in terms of whether or not they adapted their dictation toward handwritten composition and adapted their telling toward conversation. Of the six "high" children, all six adapted their dictation toward handwritten composition, whereas three of the "low" children made such an adaptation. None of the "high" children adapted their telling toward conversation, whereas five of the "low" children did. A chi-square test shows that these frequencies differ from chance significantly, X^2 (1) = 5.82, $p < .02$.

Discussion

It appears that the scale used for the Emergent Reading Ability Judgments (Reading Judgments) results in a reliable estimate of attempts to re-read handwritten and dictated stories of five-year-old children. It should be noted that the correlation was maintained and indicates stability even though children were increasing in ability between the two sessions.

The correlation of scores from the Emergent Reading Ability Judgments and from a standardized test of reading readiness is more modest but also statistically significant. Typically, reading readiness tests are used to predict subsequent reading achievement (Nurss, 1979; Sulzby, 1981a). In this comparison, the relationship can be considered to be concurrent since both kinds of measures were taken at the same time.

I turn now to the way children dealt with the described language modes. As indicated in the results, a large number of five-year-olds showed the ability to sound as if they were dictating. Twelve children were able to make a clearly observable distinction between dictation and telling. Fourteen children sounded as if they were dictating for both of their dictated stories, with two others sounding as if they were dictating on their second story. The number who sounded as if they were dictating is increased to 18 if we also include children

who sounded as if they were dictating in part.

Children were also able to sound as if they were telling a story and to actually maintain an oral monologue. Children also, however, maintained elements of conversation within their stories. Twelve children adapted their told stories toward conversation by treating the directions as a bid for a conversational-turn or by requiring questions to maintain a complete discourse.

The final comparison indicated that children who were high in reading abilities adapted dictation toward writing and children who were low in reading abilities moved their telling more toward the conversational mode. Thus children distinguish between modes, adapt modes to related modes, and make mode adaptations in a somewhat predictable direction.

From these results, there is evidence that, for children reared in a literate culture, the two modes of telling for a listener and dictating for a scribe are differentiable and that a large number of children do make such a differentiation. It also appears that the two modes, while capable of being reacted to in exactly the same manner, are interpreted by children as different tasks; furthermore, that this interpretation is predictable, both in terms of "adult" differentiation and in terms of the child's confusions with other related modes. Children tend to adapt the telling toward an

interactive interpersonal mode of communicating like conversation. They tend to adapt dictation toward the constraints of handwriting. Furthermore, children lower in reading abilities adapt more toward conversation and children higher in such abilities adapt more toward handwritten composition.

These findings need to be replicated and extended across time with children. We are currently undertaking a longitudinal study using these and similar measures to investigate the change within children across time in terms of adapting language modes.

This paper has not discussed any of the content or genre adaptations that children make, like orienting an audience toward information that the speaker/writer has but that the audience does not have (Menig-Peterson & McCabe, 1978) or like using conventions of written versus oral modes to open or close narratives (Menig-Peterson & McCabe,). Furthermore, it does not address aspects of well-formedness that might be used to predict memorability (Sulzby, 1981b). The focus for this paper was entirely upon formal aspects of prosody, fluency, and maintaining a discourse. The analysis is currently being expanded to include additional features of mode adaptation.

The Reading Judgments appear to be applicable to aspects of beginning reading that have been problematic. They are based upon one defined set of materials, dictated

and handwritten stories. It may emerge, with refinement and expansion, as a tool that the classroom teacher may use for diagnostic instruction in early reading and writing.

For now, however, the Reading Judgment used herein stresses memory for text because it is designed for use with children's own compositions. In other assessments that we are using in the larger study of which this is a part, the child's growing awareness of letter-sound relationships and of the stability of the word unit (as measured by understanding word boundaries and stability of whole-words) are factors used to measure reading ability as it emerges. It is hoped that the Reading Judgment, when combined with other well-defined assessments, may contribute to a developmental model of reading acquisition.

Table 1
Emergent Reading Ability Judgments

Score assigned	Behaviors observed
1	No dictated nor handwritten stories; hence, no attempts to re-read. Child refuses to pretend-read or pretend-write.
2	No handwritten stories produced, but some primitive evidence of reading and writing. Dictation is clearly composed of conversational characteristics and it is either not re-read or is re-read very little.
For 3-7, stories are produced, either handwritten, dictated, or both:	
3	Eyes are not on print. Child says written story "doesn't say anything," or, for dictated story, "I can't read." If child choral-reads, s/he is dependent upon examiner.
4	Eyes are not on print, but child attempts to re-read. The story thus recited is similar to original but not stable. The changes consist of additions, omissions, or temporally-changed clauses.
5	Eyes are not on print, but child attempts to re-read. Story thus recited is stable and almost verbatim to the original.
6	Eyes are on print, but the child is clearly not tracking print. Story recited is stable when compared with original. Child may be able to track print with aid of examiner but not independently. Print can be pretend-cursive, etc., <u>if</u> the story clearly accompanied the composition.
7	Child's eyes are tracking print, matching voice to print, "actually reading," independently, with attention to meaning.

Anderson, A. B., Teale, W. B., & Estrada, E. Low income children's preschool literacy experiences: Some naturalistic observations. The Quarterly Newsletter of the Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition, 1980, 59-65.

Beers, J. W., & Henderson, E. H. A study of developing orthographic concepts among first graders. Research in the Teaching of English, 1977, 11, 133-148.

Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. From conversation to composition: The role of instruction in a developmental process. In R. Glaser (Ed.), Advances in instructional psychology. Vol. 2. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, in press.

Bissex, G. L. GNYS AT WRK: A child learns to write and read. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980.

Clay, M. M. Reading: The patterning of complex behavior. 2nd ed. Auckland: Heineman Educational Books, 1978.

Cook-Gumperz, J., & Gumperz, J. J. From oral to written culture: The transition to literacy. In M. F. Whiteman (Ed.), Writing: The nature, development, and teaching of written communication. Vol. I. Hillsdale, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, in press.

Downing, J. Reading and reasoning. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1979.

Ehri, L. C. Linguistic insight: Threshold of reading acquisition. In T. G. Waller & G. E. MacKinnon (Eds.), Reading research: Advances in theory and research. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Flower, L. Writer-based prose: A cognitive basis for problems in writing. College English, 1979, 41,

Garvey, C. The contingent query: A dependent act in conversation. In R. Lewis & L. A. Rosenb (Eds.), Interaction, conversation, and the development of language. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1977.

Goodman, K. S., & Goodman, Y. M. Learning to read is natural. In L. B. Resnick & P. A. Weaver (Eds.), Theory and practice of early reading. Vol. 1. Hillsdale, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1979.

Gould, J. D. Experiments on composing letters: Some facts, some myths, and some observations. In L. W. Gregg & E. R. Steinberg (Eds.), Cognitive processes in writing. Hillsdale, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980.

Graves, D. Let children show us how to help them write. Visible Language, 1979, 13,

Gundlach, R. A. Children as writers: The beginnings of learning to write. To appear in M. Nystrand (Ed.), What writers know: The language and structure of written discourse. New York: Academic Press.

Gundlach, R. A., Litowitz, B. E., & Moses, R. A. The ontogenesis of the writer's sense of audience: Rhetorical theory and children's written discourse. In R. Brown & M. Steinmann (Eds.), Rhetoric 78. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Center for Advanced Studies in Language, Style, and Literary Theory, 1979.

Harste, J. C., Burke, C. L., & Woodward, V. A. Children's language and world: Initial encounters with print. In J. Langer & M. Smith-Burke (Eds.), Bridging the gap: Reader meets author. Newark, Del.: International Reading Association, in press.

Heath, S. B. What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and school. Paper prepared for the Terman Conference, Stanford University, November 1980.

Hildreth, G. Developmental sequences in name writing. Child Development, 1936, 7, 291-303.

Holdaway, D. The foundations of literacy. Sydney: Ashton Scholastic, 1979.

Johnson, T. Language experience: We can't all write what we can say. The Reading Teacher, 1977, 30, 297-299.

Menig-Peterson, C. L., & McCabe, A. Children's orientation of a listener to the context of their narratives. Developmental Psychology, 1978, 14, 582-592.

Menig-Peterson, C. L., & McCabe, A. Three ways of looking at a child's narrative: A psycholinguistic analysis. (Preliminary draft)

Metropolitan Readiness Tests. Level 1. Nurss, J. R., & McGauvan, M. I. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1976.

Nurss, J. R. Assessment of readiness. In T. G. Waller & G. E. MacKinnon (Eds.) Reading research: Advances in theory and practice. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Olson, D. R. The languages of instruction: The literate bias of schooling. In R. C. Anderson, R. J. Spiro, & W. E. Montague (Eds.), Schooling and the acquisition of knowledge. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1977.

Read, C. Children's awareness of language, with emphasis on sound systems. In A. Sinclair, R. J. Jarvella, & W. J. M. Levelt (Eds.), The child's conception of language. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1978.

Scollen, R., & Scollen, S. B. K. Literacy as inter-ethnic communication: An Athabaskan case. Mimeo., Alaska Native Language Center, 1979.

Siegal, S. Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw Hill, 1956.

Sulzby, E. Crossing the bridge from pre-reading to reading. Early Years, 1981, 38-39, 46. (a)

Sulzby, E. The transition from pre-reading to reading: A theoretical perspective. Mimeo., Northwestern University, Evanston, 1981. For the National Council of Teachers of English. (b)

Sulzby, E. Using children's dictated stories to aid comprehension. The Reading Teacher, 1980, 33, 772-778.

Teale, W. H. How preschoolers interact with written communication. Paper given at the Thirtieth Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference. San Diego: December 1980.

Tucker, E. S. The progress of language thesis: Its relevance for the development of writers and readers. Mimeo., Charlottesville: The University of Virginia, 1977. ED 142 955.

Vygotsky, L. S. Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Ed. by M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978.